SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990) Interim United States Attorney

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MAY 0 2 2007 RICHARD VV. VVIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

FILED

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549) Chief, Criminal Division

TIMOTHY J. LUCEY (CSBN 172332) Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7152 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234

E-mail: Timothy.Lucey@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for United States of America

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) No. CR 3 - 07 - 70026 JL
Plaintiff,	) [ <del>PROPOSED</del> ] ORDER EXCLUDING ) TIME FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
v.	Ó CALCULATION ) [18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A), (B)] )
JULIO VEGA, IRMA VEGA,	
Defendants.	}

With the agreement of the parties, and with the consent of the defendant, the Court enters this order scheduling an arraignment or preliminary hearing date of May 30, 300at 9:30 a.m. before the duty magistrate judge, as well as documenting the defendants' waiver of the preliminary hearing date under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5 and the exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b), from May 2, 2007 to May 35, 2007. The parties agree, and the Court finds and holds, as follows:

- 1. The defendants are in custody and have pending, active warrants out of Sonoma County.
- 2. The defendants both agree to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act based upon the need for defense counsel to continue to review discovery in the context of attempting to

accordig to representation

121

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

resolve this matter prior to indictment.

- 3. Counsel for the defendants believe that postponing the preliminary hearing is in his client's best interest, and that it is not prejudicial for the defendant to provide the United States with additional time to indict the case, or otherwise resolve the matter short of indictment, by a \_\_\_\_\_, 2007 preliminary hearing date.
- 4. The Court finds that, taking into the account the public interest in the prompt disposition of criminal cases, these grounds are good cause for extending the time limits for a preliminary hearing under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure
- 5. Given these circumstances, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by excluding the period from May 2, 2007 to May 3, 2007, outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and ensure effective preparation of counsel. Id. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B).
- 5. Accordingly, and with the consent of each of the defendants, the Court (1) sets a preliminary hearing date of May 30, 2007 before the duty magistrate judge at 9:30 a.m.; and (2) orders that the period from May 2, 2007 to Way 30 2007, be excluded from the time for preliminary hearings under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5 and Speedy Trial Act calculations under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)&(B)(iv).

STIPULATED: 18

DATED: 5/2/07 19

DATED: 5/2/07

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/2/07

Attorney for Defendant Irma Vega

MARK GOLDROSEN

Attorney for Defendant Julio-Vega

Assistant United States Attorney

United States Magistrate Judge